

REMARKS

Claims 30-40, 42-44, and 46-55 are pending and stand rejected, with claims 30, 40, and 42 being independent. Claims 1-29, 41, and 45 have been cancelled, and claims 56-59 have been withdrawn. Claims 30, 40, 42, and 49 have been amended. Claims 60-65 have been added. Support for the new claims and amendments may be found, for example, on pages 18-19 of the Application.

Interview

Applicant would like to thank Examiner El-chanti for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representatives during a telephonic interview conducted on May 09, 2007. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Tarnanen Rejection

Claims 30-40, 42-44, and 46-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Tarnanen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,904,026).

As amended, claim 30 recites receiving at a primary communications system "a request to access the Internet" that is issued by an online identity operating the client system. The primary communications system processes the request and identifies, "based on the processed request, a secondary communications system that is more optimally suited for providing Internet access to the client's system than the primary communications system." More specifically, the primary communications system is also "configured to act as an access point to the Internet for data communications between the client system and the Internet." Tarnanen fails to disclose or suggest at least these limitations.

Tarnanen has no regard for a primary communications system that is (1) configured to act as an access point to the Internet for data communications between the client system and the Internet and (2) is capable of identifying a secondary communications system that is more optimally suited for providing Internet access to the client's system than the primary communications system. Rather, in Tarnanen, these tasks are carried out by independent systems through distinct signaling protocols.

Specifically, FIG. 2 of Tarnanen demonstrates the process of IAP (Internet Access Provider) updating from the perspective of a Mobile Station (MS). First, the MS initiates a new Internet transaction through its currently configured IAP (step 21). Based on the information received back from its base station (steps 22-23), the client determines whether it has moved to a new IAP area (step 25), thus requiring an updated IAP connection. If so, the client updates its IAP settings (step 26) and initiates its new Internet call from a more convenient IAP.




Fig. 2

Notably, the MS does not obtain its new IAP settings from its current IAP. Instead, the MS obtains the new settings from the Service Center (10, FIG. 1), which is an entirely independent entity from any of the IAPs. Contrast Col. 2:15-30 (IAP) with Col. 4:28-49 (SC). The Service Center uses SMS messaging to providing the MS with updated IAP settings. See FIG. 4, Col. 9:37-Col. 10:13. In addition, the decision to undertake a switch to a different IAP is made at the MS, not the Service Center or the current IAP, and is based on the information received by the MS's from its local base station. See 22, FIG. 2. Finally, Tarnanen neither discloses nor suggests that the Service Center is ever used by the client as an access point to the Internet. The Service Center is accessed by the MS solely for the purpose of obtaining the updated IAP information. Therefore, neither the Service Center nor the IAPs of Tarnanen are configured to act as both access points to the Internet and also as systems capable of identifying more optimal secondary communications systems.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 30 and its respective dependent claims.

Similarly, independent claims 40 and 42 recite an arrangement in which the primary communications system is “configured to act as an access point to the Internet for data communications between the client system and the Internet.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 40 and 42 and their respective dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 30.

Furthermore, independent claim 42 recites additional allowable subject matter. Specifically, claim 42 recites “receiving, from a primary communications system . . . , an indication to process requests to access the Internet” at a secondary communications system and, “based on the indication received, reconfiguring the secondary communications system to process requests to access the Internet from the client system.” Tarnanen also does not teach or suggest the above limitations.

Tarnanen does not disclose reconfiguring the secondary communications system. Rather, in Tarnanen, it is the MS (i.e. the client) that is reconfigured with the IAP information received from the Service Center. Tarnanen does not disclose, however, that the new IAP selected by the Service Center is itself reconfigured in any way as a result of the MS changing its IAP. See step 26, FIG. 2.

For the above reasons, Tarnanen also fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of various dependent claims. For example, Tarnanen is silent as to “receiving, from the primary communications system, a subscriber information related to the online identity operating the client system” and “performing filtering of data communications between the client system and the Internet at the secondary communications system based on the received subscriber information,” as recited by claim 49. Consequently, Tarnanen also does not teach or suggest that the subscriber information includes at least one of parental control settings of the online identity or user preferences of the online identity (claim 61), or a demographic profile of the online identity (claims 62-65).


Applicant : Richard A. Watson, Jr.
Serial No. : 09/893,693
Filed : June 29, 2001
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-088001 / Network 04

For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 42 and its respective dependent claims.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,


Dmitry Brant
Reg. No. 56,133

Date: 5/9/07
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331